



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/612,853	07/03/2003	Wilhelm Bringewatt	14584.005US	4409
22870	7590	06/01/2006	EXAMINER	
LAURENCE P. COLTON 1201 WEST PEACHTREE STREET, NW 14TH FLOOR ATLANTA, GA 30309-3488			STINSON, FRANKIE L	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1746	

DATE MAILED: 06/01/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/612,853

Applicant(s)

BRINGEWATT ET AL.

Examiner

FRANKIE L. STINSON

Art Unit

1746

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: ____.

Art Unit: 1746

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1-6, 8, 9, 11, 12, 16-20 and 24-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Fesmire et al. (U. S. Pat. No. 5,992,186).

3. Claims 1-6- 9, 11, 12, 16-20 and 24-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being clearly anticipated by Japan'682 (2002-180682).

Note the aligned machines (10) in Fesmier and (22) in Japan'683.

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 7, 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fesmier in view of either Japan'683 or Southwick et al. (U. S. Pat. No. 4,561,268)
Claim 7 defines over Fesmire only in the recitation of the partition wall. Japan'683 and Southwick disclose the partition as claimed. It therefore would have been obvious to

Art Unit: 1746

one having ordinary skill in the art to modify the arrangement of Fesmire to be as taught by either Japan'683 or Southwick, to prevent injury to the user while in operation.

6. Claims 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the applied prior art in view of Pattee (U. S. Pat. No. 6,299,779).

Claim 13 defines over the applied prior art only in the recitation of the common tank.

Pattee discloses the common tank. It therefore would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to modify the device of either Fesmire of Japan'682, to employ the common tank system as taught by Pattee, for the purpose of recovering the waste water.

7. Claims 14 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the applied prior art in view of Koropitzer et al. (U. S. Pat. No. 5,694,323).

Claims 14 and 15 define over the applied prior art only in the recitation of the common and independent control. Koropitzer discloses the common and independent control. It therefore would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to modify the device of either Fesmire or Japan'682, to employ the system of Koropitzer, for the purpose of customizing the operation of the laundry system.

8. Claims 21-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over either Japan'683 or Fesmire.

Although not specifically disclosed, the typical driving arrangement as taught by either Japan'683 or Fesmire corresponds to the driving arrangement as claimed and are therefore deemed to be the functional equivalent of each other.

Art Unit: 1746


9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Lahti, Starr et al., Dreher, England et al., Capps, Freze, Drace et al., and Pellerin, note the washer arrangement.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to FRANKIE L. STINSON whose telephone number is (571) 272-1308. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F from 5:30 am to 2:00 pm and some Saturdays from approximately 5:30 am to 11:30 am.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Barr, can be reached on (571) 272-1700. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-272-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

fls


FRANKIE L. STINSON
Primary Examiner
GROUP ART UNIT 1746